

**REMARKS**

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for examining and considering the present application. Applicant also expresses gratitude to the Examiner for considering the material cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of February 25, 2005. The Office Action has been received and reviewed.

By this Amendment, claims 5-6, 11-12, 14-19, 21-26, and 28-32 are hereby amended. Claims 2-4 and 8-10 were previously canceled. Claim 33 is hereby added. Accordingly, claims 1, 5-7, and 11-33 are pending. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 13-14, 18-21, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,262,785, issued to *Kim*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For at least each of the reasons previously submitted, Applicant maintains that *Kim* is deficient in disclosing the claimed combination of features. Moreover, Applicant submits that claims 13 and 20 recite, inter alia, “a single operator.” As described in Applicant’s specification, an “operator” drives the signal electrode lines and the scan electrode lines in response to control signals provided from “a controller”. See, for example, pages 8-9 or 12-13 of Applicant’s specification.

In contrast, *Kim* discloses a controller in connection with a first driver IC for a first display and a second driver IC for a second display. See *Kim* at Figure 22. That is, *Kim* discloses at least two drivers or operators, not “a single operator.” Further, Applicant submits that an “operator” is distinct from a “controller.” The “operator” drives the signal and scan lines in response to control signals received from the controller. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

Claims 1, 5-7, 11-12, 27, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,896,575, issued to *Higginbotham et al.* (hereinafter “*Higginbotham*”), in view of *Kim*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is allowable over the applied references at least since claim 1 recites a combination of features including, for example, “a single operator for operating the first and second display means having ‘m’ scan electrode lines connecting the ‘k’ scan lines in the first display means and the ‘m-k’ scan lines in the second display means, and ‘n’ third signal electrode lines connected to the first signal lines; and a controller for providing a control signal to the operator for controlling the first and second display means, the controller enabling the first display means when the folding cover is in the open position and the controller enabling the second display means when the folding cover is in the closed position” and “wherein each of the ‘n’ second signal lines is electrically connected to a respective one of the ‘n’ first signal lines.”

Claim 7 is allowable over the applied references at least since claim 7 recites a combination of features including, for example, “a single operator for operating the first and second display means having ‘m’ signal electrode lines connecting the ‘k’ signal lines in the first display means and the ‘m-k’ signal lines in the second display means, and ‘n’ third scan electrode lines connected to the first scan lines; and a controller for providing a control signal to the operator for controlling the first and second display means, the controller enabling the first display means when the folding cover is in the open position and the controller enabling the second display means when the folding cover is in the closed position” and “wherein each of the ‘n’ second scan lines is electrically connected to a respective one of the ‘n’ first scan lines.”

Claim 27 is allowable over the applied references at least since claim 27 recites a combination of features including, for example, “a single operator for operating the first and second display devices, the single operator having ‘n’ signal electrode lines connected to the ‘n’ first signal lines, and having ‘m’ scan electrode lines connected to the ‘k’ first scan lines and the ‘m-k’ second scan lines; and a controller for providing a control signal to the operator for controlling the first and second display devices, the controller enabling the first display device when the folding cover is in the open position and the controller enabling the second display device when the folding is in the closed position” and “wherein each of the ‘n’ second signal electrodes is electrically connected to a respective one of the ‘n’ first signal lines.”

Applicant submits that *Higginbotham* and *Kim*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these features. More specifically, Applicant submits that the applied

references fail to disclose or suggest, inter alia, a “single operator” and a “controller for providing a control signal to the operator,” as recited in the claims.

*Higginbotham* fails to disclose, inter alia, “a single operator”, as admitted by the Office on at least page 5 of the Office Action dated June 30, 2005. Applicant further traverses allegations that *Kim* discloses these claimed features, particularly of a controller providing a control signal to a single operator. In contrast, *Kim* discloses a controller in connection with a first driver IC for a first display and a second driver IC for a second display. See *Kim* at Figure 22. That is, *Kim* does not disclose “a single operator.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, and 27 are patentable over the applied references and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 5-6, 11-12, and 31-32 variously depend upon claims 1, 7, and 27, respectively and are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Claims 15-17, 22-24, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Higginbotham* in view of *Kim* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,125,286, issued to *Jahagirdar et al.* (hereinafter “*Jahagirdar*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that claims 15-17, 22-24, and 28-30 are allowable for at least variously depending upon claims 13, 20, and 27 respectively, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Applicant further submits that *Jahagirdar* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Higginbotham* and *Kim*, taken singularly or in combination.

For example, *Jahagirdar* fails to disclose or suggest a mobile station comprising at least “a single operator for operating the first and second liquid crystal displays having a plurality of signal electrode lines connected to the first signal lines, and a plurality of scan electrode lines connected to the first scan lines and the second scan lines” and “each of the second scan lines electrically connected to a respective one of the first scan lines,” as recited in claim 13.

*Jahagirdar* also fails to disclose or suggest a mobile station comprising at least “a single operator for operating the first and second liquid crystal displays having a plurality of signal

electrode lines connected to the first signal lines, and a plurality of scan electrode lines connected to the first scan lines and the second scan lines” and “each of the second signal lines electrically connected to a respective one of the first signal lines,” as recited in claim 20.

In addition, *Jahagirdar* fails to disclose or suggest a mobile station comprising at least “a single operator for operating the first and second display devices, the single operator having ‘n’ signal electrode lines connected to the ‘n’ first signal lines, and having ‘m’ scan electrode lines connected to the ‘k’ first scan lines and the ‘m-k’ second scan lines; and a controller for providing a control signal to the operator for controlling the first and second display devices, the controller enabling the first display device when the folding cover is in the open position and the controller enabling the second display device when the folding is in the closed position” and “wherein each of the ‘n’ second signal electrodes is electrically connected to a respective one of the ‘n’ first signal lines and the second side is opposite to the first side,” as recited in claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 20, and 27 are patentable over the applied references and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 15-17, 22-24, and 28-30 variously depend from claims 13, 20, and 27 respectively and are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Furthermore, Applicant submits new claim 33 for the Examiner’s consideration. New claim 33 is allowable for the combination of features recited therein. Accordingly, favorable consideration is respectfully requested together with an indication of the allowability of claim 33.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

Application No.: 09/633,061

Docket No.: 8737.037.00-US

C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
**Mark R. Kresloff**

Registration No.: 42,766

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant